DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 451 SO 013 528

AUTHOR Sanders, Nicholas M.: Chapman, Marian L.
TITLE Skills for Ethical Action: A Report on the Program Evaluation, 1976-77.
INSTITUTION Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 45p.: For a related document, see SO 013 527.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audiovisual Aids: Case Studies: *Ethical Instruction: Feedback: Junior High School Students: Program Development: *Program Effectiveness: Program Evaluation: Secondary Education: *Skill Development: Student Attitudes: Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Skills for Ethical Action Program

ABSTRACT

This evaluation report focuses on the strengths and weaknesses of the 38 lessons in the 1976-1977 version of "Skills for Ethical Action," (SEA). SEA is a program based on a set of audiovisual instructional materials developed to teach junior high school students a behavioral strategy for acting ethically. The overall objective of the SEA strategy is to help students "do something which they have decided is fair after considering the possible effects on self and others." The six major steps in the SEA strategy are identifying the value problem, thinking up action ideas, considering self and other, judging, acting, and evaluating. The 38 lessons of SEA instruction evaluated in this report focused on student responsibilities in SEA, case studies about teenagers holding specified values, uses of SEA strategies to handle personal value problems, and use of SEA to make a personal value more meaningful. The evaluation method involved review of all lessons by educators not involved in the project, review of all lessons by SEA staff with particular emphasis on affirmative action aspects of the course, studies of classroom use of SEA, analysis of all students' written SEA class work, and analysis of a questionnaire administered to all students upon completion of the program. The sample consisted of 323 students in 12 junior high school classrooms in four suburban and five urban school districts of a major American city. Findings indicated that students generally liked working with audio cassettes, sometimes reacted negatively to delivery styles of narrators employed on the tapes, found some case studies inappropriate or unrealistic, and felt they learned a lot about consideration for others as a result of participating in the lessons. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205451

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MARIAN L. CHAPMAN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SKILLS FOR ETHICAL ACTION:
A REPORT ON THE PROGRAM EVALUATION
1976-77

Nicholas M. Sanders and Marian L. Chapman

December, 1977

30 013 528

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
Suite 1700/1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19103

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is based on the work of many other persons. In particular, the authors wish to note the contributions to the evaluation effort made by Rita Tolbert, the field coordinator, and Florence Davis and Henry Campiglia, staff writers. Ms. Tolbert provided the careful observations and teacher interview reports in addition to assembling data and writing portions of the case studies. Ms. Davis, assisted by Mr. Campiglia, undertook the preparation of the lesson analyses which are the bases of the formative evaluation aspects of the study. Linda Lange and Marcia Cohen gave excellent clerical support.

We also wish to thank all the teachers and students who have participated in the program over its years of development. Their willingness to complete reports and share their opinions with the staff have allowed for this evaluative effort.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
Skills for Ethical Action, the 1976-77 Version	1
The SEA strategy	2
The units of SEA instruction	3
SEA objectives	4
SEA materials	5
The Development of SEA	6
Purposes of 1976-77 Evaluation Activities	7
METHODS	10
Classroom Studies	10
Sampling	10
Arrangements for study participation	12
Information collection procedures	12
Information analysis procedures	16
External Reviews	17
Affirmative Action Review	18
FINDINGS	19
Case Studies	19
Case A	19
Case B	21
Case C	23
Case D	25
Case E	26
Case F	28
Conclusion of the case studies	30
Formative Evaluation	30
Presentation mode	30
Student considerations	31
Unit II revisions	33
Changes in objectives	34
Privacy issues	35
Teacher's Manual design	36
CURRENT VERSION OF SEA	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY	41

INTRODUCTION

Skills for Ethical Action (SEA) is a set of instructional materials developed at Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) to teach seventh-, eighth-, and ninth-grade students a strategy, or process, that enables them to act ethically in their daily lives.[1] Since the fall of 1974, SEA has undergone a number of small-scale classroom tryouts and reviews by consultants to determine what revisions should be incorporated to make the materials more instructionally sound and appealing. Although some of this evaluation background is provided, this paper is primarily a report on the evaluation activities carried out during the 1976-77 school year and the resultant modifications in SEA.

The pages in this section contain a description of the version of SEA that was evaluated, a short history of the development of SEA, and the purposes of the 1976-77 evaluation.

Skills for Ethical Action, the 1976-77 Version

The version of SEA of concern in this evaluation report consisted of 38 lessons, each designed for a half-hour instructional period and related to one another in a fixed order of presentation. Salient aspects of the program are the SEA strategy, the unit organization of the

---

[1] "Ethical action" is defined in SEA as action undertaken after objectively deciding what is fair, based on consideration of probable consequences to all persons, including oneself.

instruction, the objectives, and some characteristics of the SEA materials themselves.

The SEA strategy. The instructional core of the SEA program is a six-step strategy which combines actions consistent with self-held values, ethical decision making, and evaluation of completed actions.

In the first step, Identify the Value Problem, the students described a situation that presented a problem or that indicated they were not doing enough to show that one of their values was meaningful. They named the value involved and then formally stated their problem.

The second step, Think up Action Ideas, asked the students to brainstorm ideas for actions that might help them handle their problem. The students then checked their action ideas to make sure they were stated specifically and were possible to implement.

Consider Self and Others was the third step of the strategy. Here the students thought about how their action ideas might affect their own values, feelings, health and safety, and possessions. They also obtained information using course-taught methods about how others might be affected in these four areas. Finally, the students considered what might happen if everyone acted as they were thinking of acting.

The next step, Judge, asked the students to objectively review and summarize the information gathered in Step 3 and to judge whether their actions would be ethical, i.e., whether the actions would have mostly positive effects on everyone. They could change or reject those actions which they deemed not ethical.

In the fifth step, Act, the students chose one of the actions judged to be ethical and made a commitment to carry out that action. They were also called upon to persevere until the action was completed.

In the final step of the strategy, Evaluate, the students examined the effects of the action they had completed and asked themselves whether it did indeed produce mostly positive effects on everyone. They also reviewed how well they used each strategy step and examined the importance of the value which they acted upon.

The units of SEA instruction. The 38 SEA lessons were grouped sequentially into four units.

The first unit consisted of ten lessons. These lessons presented the student responsibilities in SEA, analyzed the SEA definition of "ethical action," and introduced the SEA strategy.

In the 11 lessons of the second unit, the students practiced using the strategy in a simulation involving four case studies about teenagers holding specified values. The practice involved working together on the cases with classmates in small groups, utilizing the strategy steps. The Act step of the strategy was simulated by acting out the action in an improvised drama. The definition of "ethical action," and the dispositions of caring for others, of acting consistently with one's values, and of being fair in judging potential consequences were linked to the strategy steps as a part of the unit instruction. In addition, role-taking and decision-making skills were introduced.

The third unit contained nine lessons during which the students practiced using the strategy to handle value problems present in their own lives. The students were to expand their knowledge of their own values by ranking general value terms and were provided with further practice in application of the skills introduced earlier. This unit emphasized the subprocesses needed to complete each step of the strategy, and the students were expected to actually carry out the action they had decided was ethical.

In the final unit, the students were asked to use the strategy in order to make one of their own values more meaningful in their lives. The unit stressed the value-oriented initiation of the strategy use rather than the specific problem-oriented mode of the previous unit. Again, the students were called upon to actually carry out the action. The concept of "others" was expanded to include persons beyond those immediately and obviously involved. The course ended with the request that the students project future circumstances in which they might use the strategy. This unit consisted of eight lessons.

SEA objectives. Every SEA lesson was designed to achieve at least one specific objective, and these objectives were presented in the SEA Teacher's Manual, along with the lessons to which they were related. However, more generally, SEA was designed to teach the strategy described previously. As the students practiced using the strategy, it was postulated that the strength of several values or dispositions would be increased also. These are: the tendency to act on self-proclaimed

values, concern for the welfare of others, and objectivity in decision making. Finally, in addition to fostering these dispositions, SEA was to develop the skills needed to use the strategy. These are the skills that enable a person to translate values into actions that have been objectively considered and judged to have mostly positive effects on everyone, including oneself.

SEA materials. The instructional materials included cassette audio tapes that could be used to present 34 of the 38 SEA lessons to a class. (For most of these 34 taped lessons the teacher was also provided with elaborate guidance as to how to present the lesson without using the tape.) The instruction on the tapes was provided in Units I and III by a male narrator who spoke slowly and in Units II and IV by a female narrator who spoke more rapidly. The tape presentations also included modeling of some of the content by boys and girls, some Black, some White. Finally, music was used as a part of each lesson introduction as well as during the times allowed on tape for student activity.

The lessons referred the students to 44 study book pages and three filmstrips, which gave visual support to the primarily audio instruction. In addition, there were 21 worksheets to be completed in conjunction with the SEA lessons.

The SEA Teacher's Manual included suggestions for materials preparation, classroom arrangement, the objectives, and a lesson plan for each of the 38 lessons. It also included outline descriptions of all presentation modes possible (tape, tape and teacher, or teacher) and suggestions for remedial activities. In addition, the Manual contained a reproduction

of each audio script, annotated with suggested discussion questions, guidelines for teacher participation, and classroom management recommendations. Copies of student materials, tests, and scoring directions for each of the four unit tests were also included. In all, the SEA Teacher's Manual had 680 typescript pages and was contained in a 21-inch-thick, three-ring binder.

The Development of SEA[2]

The 1976-77 version of SEA was the outcome of over two-and-a-half years of developmental effort. Based on a previous success experience, those in charge of its development began with the orientations that (1) the course would teach a strategy, or process, that would include as an integral part acting on issues of personal importance, and (2) the teacher of the course should have available an audio-taped presentation of all, or practically all, of the instruction. To provide the knowledge base in moral and values education that would inform about the current state of knowledge and practice, a small library of over 1800 books and articles, and 55 different sets of curricular materials was built, and was used extensively during the first year of development efforts.[3]

---

[2] See the SEA Teacher's Manual: Volume 1. (Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1977) pp. 37-43, for a more elaborate description of SEA's developmental history.

[3] This knowledge base also provided for the following publications: Marcia B. Klafter and Joan Wallace. A Bibliography on Moral/Values Education. (Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1976), and Nicholas M. Sanders and Marcia B. Klafter. The Importance and Desired Characteristics of Moral/Ethical Education in the Public Schools of the U.S.A.: A Systematic Analysis of Recent Documents. (Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., June, 1975).

As soon as the SEA staff was able to produce an intellectually defensible ethical action strategy to be taught in the envisioned course, empirical testing began with students from the target population before additional course development was undertaken. As may be seen in Table 1, student tryouts of either components or complete versions of SEA were almost continuous between fall, 1974, and fall, 1976. The teachers and students involved were the sources of information that was critical to the development of a classroom-worthy course. More specifically, the presentations were observed, informal interviews were conducted, and tests and questionnaires were used, in order to determine where and how the course might be revised to improve its appeal and instructional value.

The development process during these years also included seeking reviews of the course materials by experts. There were three such reviews. First, a philosophy-of-education scholar, whose special area of expertise was moral education, reviewed the course for its philosophical validity. Second, a director of a values education center, who had considered many values education courses for use in public schools, reviewed the quality of instructional design of the course. And, finally, a board member of a number of civic/educational groups and member of a large city mayor's advisory committee on community improvement reviewed the course to determine whether any ethnic or interest group might be offended by the contents.

Purposes of 1976-77 Evaluation Activities

As may be noted by reference to Table 1, the nature of all SEA

TABLE 1

Student Tryouts

Prior to the 1976-77 Evaluation

Dates	Nature of SEA Presentation	Sample
Oct. & Nov. '74	SEA staff "talked through" the first version of the strategy.	9 selected eighth graders (School I)
Nov. '74 - Jan.'75	SEA staff presented 9 lessons on the strategy	31 regular class, eighth graders (School I)
May - June '75	SEA staff presented 9 revised lessons focusing on instructional activities	11 selected seventh graders (School II)
July - Aug. '75	SEA staff presented the spring '75 version of 23 lessons	17 selected seventh and eighth graders (School III)
Nov. '75 - Mar. '76	SEA staff presented redesigned (fall '75) version of 43 lessons	29 regular class, eighth graders (School III)
Feb. - June '76	Teacher managed, with SEA staff consultation, the tape presentation of redesigned (winter '76) version of 39 lessons	31 regular class, eighth graders (School III) 26 "problem" class, seventh graders (School IV)
July - Aug. '76	Teacher managed, SEA staff presentation of redesigned (summer '76) version of 36 lessons	18 selected seventh graders (School III)

presentations in student tryouts had entailed at least SEA staff consultation with the teacher, if not direct presentations by the SEA staff. In other words, prior to the fall, 1976, SEA had not been studied under conditions of freedom from direct developer influence. Thus, one purpose of the 1976-77 evaluation activities was to study SEA classroom presentations under such conditions.

Another purpose was to note the variation among classroom settings. The past tryouts of SEA versions, as may be seen in Table 1, involved at most two classes at the same time. In fact, most of the revisions in SEA versions were based upon information from White, middle-class teachers and their White, suburban, middle-class students. A wide variety of school settings and students was sought for the 1976-77 study of SEA.

Under the conditions implied by the two purposes described above, the evaluation study was designed to accomplish two major goals. First, there was a need to examine information about how the course was presented and what the effects were, in order to further refine the course. And, secondly, there was an interest in trying to depict the status of SEA development through portrayals of its use and effects in particular classrooms. The latter is referred to as the "case studies"; the former is called the "formative evaluation."

Also, it was necessary to consider expert perspectives on (1) the placement of SEA in various parts of the curriculum, (2) the use of SEA in relation to other moral and values education courses and programs, and (3) threats to, or degradation of, any religious principles or practices by SEA.

METHODS

The evaluation was based primarily upon studies of the classroom use of SEA. However, the evaluation also drew upon reviews by educators outside of RBS and ongoing affirmative action checks conducted by SEA staff. Because these three sources of evaluative information required different methods, the following description of methods involves a subsection devoted to each source.

Classroom Studies

The major source of information for the evaluation was the studies of the use of SEA in classes. The following describes the sampling, the arrangements for participation in the study, the ways of collecting information, and the use of the information collected.

Sampling. The target population for SEA was considered to be students in seventh-, eighth-, and ninth-grade classes. With the purpose of studying SEA use in a variety of school settings, recruitment efforts were designed to contact school personnel in a large city and its suburban districts. The first contact initiated by the SEA staff was usually with a school-district level administrator with responsibility for curriculum and/or instruction. Then there were follow-up contacts with principals and, eventually, with teachers. This process, while not resulting in a representative sample of teachers or students, was assumed to be similar to an instructional materials marketing process and, therefore, should result in a sample representative of future users of SEA.

Descriptive information concerning the sample is presented in Table 2. All classes completed all lessons of SEA, except the classes 1-1 and 1-2, which completed only Units I and II due to class schedule constraints.

Arrangements for study participation. In order to become involved in presenting SEA to their classes, teachers had to be willing to try to present the full SEA program of 38 lessons and to assist the SEA evaluation staff in data collection. They also were required to participate in a three-hour training workshop prior to their classroom presentations of SEA. The workshop was designed to familiarize them further both with the SEA program, a part of which they were asked to experience as students, and with the data collection needs of the study.

In return, RBS supplied the SEA materials free of charge and paid the teachers an honorarium for time required beyond normal classroom preparation.

Information collection procedures. The overall purpose of collecting data was to provide information in four areas. These areas were presentation, acceptability to the teachers, acceptability to students, and effectiveness. Information was obtained in each of these areas by a variety of methods.

First, the participating SEA teachers completed a teacher's report form on each of the 38 lesson presentations. Some parts of this form related to how SEA was presented (e.g., time used and difference in presentation from the procedure in Manual), while others referred to issues of how the teacher perceived SEA (e.g., difficulty and management problems).

TABLE 2

Descriptive Information Concerning the 1976-77 Sample for Classroom Studies of SEA

Characteristic	School-Class Code[a]								
	1-1/1-2	2-1	3-1/3-2	4-1	5-1/5-2	6-1	7-1	8-1	9-1
Location	Suburb	Suburb	Suburb	Suburb	Urban	Urban	Urban	Urban	Urban
Type	PN[b]	Cath	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	Magnet[c]
Class grade	8	8	7	9	7	8	9	7&8	7
Class size	21/18	18	29/29	27	30/35[d]	35	18	31	32
% non-white in class	0/0	6	0	0	33/33	100	100	100	59
Class verbal ability[e]	30/54	53	70/64	29	30/14	38	4	19&16	81

[a]The school-class code contains two numerals. The first numeral indicates the order in which the school became involved in the study, while the second number is merely for class identification purposes.

[b]"PN" is used as an abbreviation for public, neighborhood school.

[c]This "magnet" school selected volunteer students from across the large public school district.

[d]About 20 percent of the students were shifted between the two classes.

[e]The figure given is the grade-related percentile rank of the class mean on the Verbal Part of the Cooperative School and College Ability Test, Series II (SCAT) administered by a member of the SEA staff prior to SEA instruction. Form 3A of the SCAT was used for all classes. Further information is presented in SCAT Series II: Handbook. Educational Testing Service; Princeton, N.J., 1967.

The form also included a question concerning changes the teacher wished to recommend.

In order to review and clarify the teacher's reports on the lesson presentations and to obtain additional teacher input with regard to the progress of the course, the completed teacher report forms were collected and reviewed with the teacher in an interview conducted by the SEA field coordinator after every third to fourth lesson presentation. This interview session allowed the teacher to orally communicate perceptions of the course related to all the points on the teacher report form, to elaborate upon aspects of the instructional content, and to clarify evaluation checkpoints used. These sessions also allowed the teacher to communicate his/her perceptions of how the students were responding to the course.

A third procedure, the classroom observation, served to collect information about how SEA was being presented and about how students were reacting. The observations were conducted by the SEA field coordinator usually every third to fourth lesson presentation. The SEA field coordinator focused on a number of events during the observed lesson presentations. These events fall into six catetories: time, instructional mode, particular instructional and other modifications and/or elaborations of the lesson as it was depicted in the SEA Teacher's Manual, student reactions to the content and activities of the lessons, disruptions outside the presentation, and supplementary assignments given by the teacher.

The final method used in the classroom studies to gain information regarding the teacher's overall impressions of SEA-related events was an

interview conducted by the SEA evaluator with the individual teacher after the program had been presented in its entirety. The final interview covered both preser ation issues (such as what makeup procedures were used for absentees) and acceptability issues (such as perceptions of the value of SEA for the students and evaluations of the taped lessons).

The three means for gathering information regarding students' acceptance of SEA were the collection of all the students' written SEA class work, a questionnaire administered to all the students upon completion of the program, and the classroom observations described above.

The purpose of the End-of-Course Questionnaire was to measure three areas of student response: disposition, knowledge, and reaction to SEA. The dispositional and knowledge items all relate to SEA objectives achievement and are discussed in the following paragraphs. The third area, student reaction to the program, covered a number of items in order to measure the students' perceptions of the value of SEA, its difficulty, hurt or upset caused, and interest.

All of the students' written work, coded by the students to preserve their anonymity, was examined by the development staff. The responses of students in each class were summarized as to level of completion, quality, and sense of relationship to desired responses. The students' responses provided not only student acceptance information, but also a level of effectiveness data for the particular lesson part in which they occurred.

Effectiveness in terms of achievement of objectives was studied by use of test items that were constructed to measure directly most of the

specified objectives associated with SEA lessons. These items, along with the instructional objectives they were designed to measure and the directions for scoring the items, were reviewed for objective-item congruence by the SEA developer and two RBS evaluators not assigned to the SEA project. Where necessary, modifications were made in an item or its related objective to bring the two into agreement.

Items referenced to instructional objectives occurring in a given unit made up the tests for that unit. These tests were administered by the teacher to the students both prior to and following presentations of the respective SEA units. For each unit pre- and posttest, the answers of at least five students in each of at least two classes were scored by two independent scorers. After a comparison of the results from the two scorers, scoring directions were clarified and additional double scorings were conducted where necessary to obtain a high degree of agreement. The remainder of the answers to the particular test was scored by only one of the two scorers.

The remaining SEA objectives-referenced items were administered as part of the End-of-Course Questionnaire. This questionnaire was administered by the SEA evaluator soon after all SEA presentation was completed. An item that relates to anticipated future use of the strategy and one that has to do with recall of the strategy were especially critical items in that they were designed to measure the degree of achievement of the objectives for which most other SEA objectives may be considered instrumental.

Information analysis procedures. The information collected by the above methods was analyzed in two different ways, to serve the two major goals of (1) portrayal of the use of SEA as a whole in several "case studies" (a type of status report) and (2) revision of specific aspects of SEA to improve the course.

In the case study analyses, the data from six of the nine teachers' classes were organized to answer three major questions for each case. Of course, one of these questions was, "Was SEA effective in producing the desired changes in the students?" To answer this question, both gains from pre- to post instruction and absolute levels of postinstruction performance on the objectives-referenced tests were used. Also of major concern was the question, "Did the teacher and/or the students value and enjoy SEA?" The teacher report forms, interviews with the teachers, SEA staff observations during SEA lesson presentations, and the End-of-Course Questionnaire that the students completed were the sources of information used to answer that question. Finally, in order to evaluate the sufficiency of the study of SEA by looking at the results of the particular classroom use case, the question, "Was it a good test of SEA?" was asked. This question was answered using the teacher's reports and interviews and the SEA staff observations.

The formative evaluation, which was designed to pinpoint aspects of SEA needing revision and to suggest ways in which those aspects might be revised, used basically the same data as the case studies. However, the formative evaluation involved organizing that data to refer to specific

aspects of SEA instead of to particular teacher-class cases. Also, data from all nine teachers' classes were used in this aspect of the evaluation. This revision-oriented analysis resulted in a report on each of the 38 SEA lessons. On any topic in the report (e.g., effectiveness of the lesson in achieving its objectives), the results from all of the classes involved in the study were presented (e.g., changes from before to after instruction in percent of students in each class who were correct on the test item associated with that lesson's objective). Thus, the major outcome of these analyses are 38 lesson analysis reports. However, for purposes of conveying the changes in SEA so that they may be comprehended without going through every lesson report, these analyses were summarized by relating the changes implied into a relatively manageable number of categories, presented as subsections of the Findings section of this report.

External Reviews

The 1976-77 version of SEA underwent review by educators employed outside of RBS. Their roles in the review, as well as their particular positions of related expertise, are described in the following paragraphs.

The 1976-77 version of SEA was reviewed by a curriculum and instruction scholar who has published extensively in the area of moral education. He was asked to review the program instruction in fulfilling its objectives, the place of the program's intended outcomes in relation to moral education in general, and the usefulness of the program in the school curriculum.

A second reviewer was a school district-level administrator whose main concern was the social studies aspect of the curriculum in a large metropolitan school district. The SEA staff asked him to consider issues of implementation that would affect the potential for public school use of the 1976-77 version of SEA.

Because the area of moral values is a substantial aspect of religious orientations, the SEA staff also sought a review by a person or persons who would be qualified to judge any religious connotations that might be unsuitable for materials intended for public school use. Two scholars at a university-based center specializing in the relation between public education and religion took on that review task.

Affirmative Action Review

The third type of evaluation activity was an ongoing check for affirmative action aspects of the course, which was applied to both the 1976-77 version and to the revisions of the 1976-77 version. The review procedures and standards were those developed by SEA staff following guidelines set by kBS.

First, there were counts across all materials of the race/ethnicity, sex, and any handicap of the major, minor, and background characters; these counts were to ascertain that an appropriate diversity of individuals was represented among the characters. In addition, there was a check of the physical traits of those characters depicted in illustrations, to ensure absence of graphic stereotypes. Finally, the characters' social relationships, activities, and personal traits were reviewed to avoid

stereotypes and to provide a balance in characterization. Standards involving language considerations were also applied to SEA materials. A main concern with the audio script was how pronoun references were handled.

FINDINGS

The findings are presented under two general headings. First, there are the findings of the case studies, including brief descriptions of the nature of SEA presentation and its impact in each of several classroom "cases." Second, there is the summary of the findings related to improving SEA, the formative evaluation.

Case Studies

Case studies were made for six of the nine sites involved in the classroom use study. The analysis of data for the case studies was restricted by practical concerns to six of the nine cases. The six cases chosen represent among them a wide range of school settings and student backgrounds. The case study reports that follow are presented and labeled in a way that is designed to maintain the anonymity of the students, teachers, and schools involved. Reference here to teachers by third person, singular pronouns is designed also to protect anonymity; i.e., "he" and "she" are used randomly among the cases.

Case A. Both classes in Case A provided moderately good tests of SEA. The teacher departed only slightly from the SEA developer's intents for SEA lesson presentations. Time allowed to present the SEA lessons was adequate. Students had a high attendance rate, and were encouraged to learn SEA concepts by the external motivation of being graded on their

work. Only a ten-week long interruption of lesson presentations and an initial negativism toward RBS on the part of some students prevented the situation from providing an ideal test of SEA.

With the exception of a dislike for the pace and tone of the taped instructional narration, the teacher's evaluation of SEA was positive. She was especially enthusiastic about the "logical, thorough development of content" in the course. She thought almost all the lessons were at an appropriate level of difficulty for her class, and there was evidence on only one occa ion of a minor class management problem arising from SEA activities. The SEA Teacher's Manual was considered adequate, and the preparation requirements for lesson presentations were considered reasonable. She did find that fitting SEA into an already full curriculum was difficult; she suggested that a shorter version of the course would be easier to fit, but at the same time cautioned against abbreviation that would disrupt the good development of content within and between lessons.

Although the students seemed attentive and involved during lesson presentations, the teacher believed that they were somewhat negative about SEA even before lessons were begun. By the end of the course, the overwhelming majority in both classes were expressing strong dislike for the course. Most of these students said that SEA was less useful than their other courses. Some expressed upset with the course for leading to an invasion of their privacy; most expressed boredom and the convinction that SEA had been a waste of time.

However, the students' achievement of SEA objectives was higher than their course-related attitudes would imply. A high level of performance

was especially evident on the cognitive type of objectives, such as knowledge of the strategy. On the other hand, there was a very low level of intent to use the strategy. Finally, both the teacher and her students generally thought SEA was neither too difficult nor too easy.

The above comments concerning SEA effectiveness and acceptability of the course to the students apply almost equally to both classes. One class was slightly more positive and achieved slightly more on the unit tests, but the differences were so small as to leave no need for two different summaries.

In conclusion, SEA was well-implemented in Case A and well-received by the teacher. Although SEA was effective in teaching many of its objectives to these students, the students generally did not view the course positively.

Case B. This case did not provide a good test of SEA. Class 1 provided a better test situation than class 2. The teacher departed from the SEA developer's intents for lesson presentation only slightly in class 1, while there was a greater degree of departure in class 2. Also, though absences were at a rate of about 10 percent per lesson in class 1, they were over 20 percent in class 2. There was no regular provision for make-ups in either class. Finally, in the last half of the course both classes were faced with class periods that were too short for lesson completion.

Although the teacher was generally positive about most aspects of SEA, he did feel the need for greater elaboration and clarification of terms and activities directions. His concern was greater for class 2 and

involved almost one tenth of class 2's lessons. (The students, however, perceived the course as about right in its level of difficulty and as of about the same difficulty as or even easier than their other courses.) However, with a few reservations, the teacher thought the SEA Teacher's Manual was quite complete, he believed that the preparation required for SEA lesson presentation was reasonable, and he valued the audio-taped lesson presentations. Finally, he judged a large majority of the SEA lesson parts as posing no problems.

The students' responses to aspects of SEA were mixed. The classroom observation reports indicate that class 2 was generally quite attentive to SEA lesson presentations, while class 1 was much less so. The teacher thought that Unit II was not interesting to the students in either class primarily because the roles they were asked to play were not realistic in their life experiences. He also pointed out that in Unit III they were not ready to involve themselves personally by using the strategy with a problem situation from their own lives. Nonetheless, about one-half of the students in each class said on the End-of-Course Questionnaire that they were glad to have had SEA and believed they learned important things in the course. The other half said they were bored.

SEA's effectiveness in Case B is also a mixed picture. SEA was effective in increasing objectives-related achievement in class 1, but was less effective with class 2. The level of unit test scores was generally very low, especially in class 2. This distinction between classes became more exaggerated on a measure of strategy knowledge, with

over one half of class 1 students exhibiting a functional knowledge of some of the strategy processes, while no one in class 2 attained that level of knowledge. However, among those class 1 students only about 20 percent of those sufficiently knowledgeable seemed disposed to actually use the strategy.

Case B should probably be divided into two subcases, class 1 and class 2, for purposes of conclusions. Although neither subcase provided for a good test of SEA, implementation in class 1 was much better than that in class 2. The objectives-referenced tests revealed that class 1 knew more of SEA than class 2, with class 1's level of achievement being low to medium, while class 2's was very low. Also, the teacher believed that while both classes had some difficulty with SEA instruction, class 2 was more dramatically affected. Only on indices of student acceptance of SEA did the class differences decrease, with about half of each class liking and valuing the SEA experience. The teacher was generally positive about the course.

Case C. Case C provided a very good test of SEA. The SEA lessons were presented with only slight departure from the SEA developer's intents. The time for lesson presentation was always much more than enough. The absentee rate was 8 percent per lesson, but those who were absent had ample opportunity to review missed lessons. Also, the students were held accountable for the SEA work by being graded on it. Furthermore, the teacher provided much review and additional homework assignments to supplement regular SEA instruction and review.

The teacher was quite positive about SEA. She rated over 70 percent of the lesson parts as being "especially good." She praised the SEA Teacher's Manual and found lesson preparation requirements to be reasonable. She found no management problems associated with SEA activities, only one occasion of student difficulty with materials, and only one occasion of harm -- which she believed could be easily corrected. Finally, she appreciated and used the audio-tape presentation of lessons very often.

Practically every indication of student reaction to SEA was positive. Four out of every five students said that they were glad they had the course. The teacher reported high degrees of student interest and participation through the third unit; she said that attention and interest waned somewhat during Unit IV only because students were ready to leave school for the summer. Most students believed that SEA was about right in difficulty. Every student listed some aspect of SEA as being personally useful, and SEA was rated by most students as being of about the same usefulness as their other courses.

The findings with regard to SEA effectiveness in Case C are mixed. First, there was definite improvement on the objectives-referenced measures, though the level of achievement was slightly less than half the possible points. Also, almost two thirds of the students demonstrated at least partially functional knowledge of the SEA strategy, though it was estimated that only about one fourth of the students were both sufficiently postive about strategy use and knowledgeable enough to put at least some aspects of the strategy into use. However, the teacher noted several instances of use of course concepts and techniques outside SEA lessons.

In conclusion, Case C provided a good test of SEA. It was characterized by positive teacher and student reaction to the course, and some evidence for SEA's effectiveness was obtained.

Case D. Case D provided a generally good test of SEA. The teacher varied only slightly from the developer's intents for lesson presentations. The time period available for SEA lessons was usually quite adequate. After the first unit, tests were graded, and the students seemed serious about their test performances. Absences were few, and a coverage of at least the essentials of missed SEA lessons was arranged. However, the teacher did believe that one of the students in the class was quite disruptive to most of the class meetings.

The teacher's view of SEA was generally positive, with some salient negative points as well. The large proportion of lessons was considered either problem-free or especially good. Her major problems were with Unit II group activities and dramas, which posed classroom management problems. Only at those times did she think that the SEA lessons required an unreasonably long preparation time. She herself believed that the taped SEA lessons presented instruction very efficiently, but her students seemed throughout the course to be unable to attend to directions presented by the tape.

As noted above, there were problems in doing the group work and reluctance in producing the dramas required in Unit II. Nevertheless, the teacher and SEA observer had seen only a few signs of negative student reaction to the course prior to Unit IV. Thereafter, reactions of most

students were negative. At the end of the course the majority said that the course was boring, too difficult, and less useful than their other courses.

Although the SEA lessons were effective in increasing objectives-referenced achievement, neither that achievement nor the strategy knowledge and use orientation of the students revealed more than moderate levels of objectives achievement. Also, while the teacher did believe that the students would use aspects of the course, she said that she could offer no evidence for her belief.

In conclusion, under the generally positive conditions for studying SEA in Case D, there was a generally positive teacher reaction, an increasingly negative student reaction from earlier to later in the course and a low to moderate level of SEA effectiveness.

Case E. Case E provided a situation favorable to the testing of SEA. A district administrator chose the teacher as the best teacher to work with the course and then encouraged the teacher in SEA presentations. The teacher was enthusiastic throughout the presentations and well prepared, remaining quite close in lesson presentation to the SEA developer's intents. The class was rather small, the students seemed to respect the teacher highly, and there seemed to be good rapport between students and teacher. The students were absent very seldom. The class periods were considerably longer than required for SEA lessons, and the pace of the usual lesson presentation seemed leisurely, often with extended, relevant discussions. Only a somewhat irregular rate of presentation, broken within SEA units

two times by an extended period of no SEA, prevented the situation from being the ideal.

As presented above, the teacher's general reaction to SEA from start through finish was positive, enthusiastic. He judged practically one-half of the SEA lessons to be of especially good instructional quality and found no problems with almost all the rest. He believed there were no problems of classroom management or harm to students arising from SEA and found less than 1 percent of the SEA lesson parts to be at an inappropriate difficulty level. He thought the preparation time and resource requirements for lesson presentations were reasonable. He thought the SEA Teacher's Manual was adequate, except for a few minor points. His only negative reactions were to the tone and pace of the narrators and the tone of the teenagers' voices used to model on the audio-taped lessons.

The students' reactions to SEA were also generally positive, with 72 percent of the students saying they were glad they'd had the course, and two thirds of the students saying that SEA was more personally useful than their other courses. The majority thought SEA was about right in its level of difficulty, with most of the remaining students believing it was easy.

With this class SEA was effective in leading to a high level of performance on objectives-related test items. Most students had a thorough knowledge of the strategy. It was estimated that about two thirds of the class was sufficiently experienced, positive about future use, and knowledgeable enough to put at least some aspects of the strategy into future

use. Also, the teacher did believe that he had seen an improvement in the interactions of the students outside the class during gym and lunch-time sports.

In summary, under the positive conditions provided by Case E, SEA was a generally well-liked course that improved objectives-related knowledge and skills to a high level of achievement.

Case F. Case F posed a challenge for SEA. In a school with much interpersonal conflict and fighting, the class involved in SEA was a special one for students who were more difficult to manage than the regular students. Also, the tested verbal ability of the students in Case F was extremely low.

Perhaps closely related to these features of the setting is the fact that the teacher presented SEA in a way which departed considerably from the developer's intents. His comments on most of the modifications indicate that the changes were meant to make SEA more realistic, interesting, and intellectually available to his particular students. While his modifications may have made his own and his students' evaluations of SEA more positive than if the changes were not made, the changes also resulted in considerable departure from the SEA objectives. Thus, Case F did not pose a good test of SEA.

While the teacher's judgment of the program was heavily influenced by his view of its inappropriateness for the special class students in Case F, he saw some positive aspects of SEA itself, including "the best teacher's manual" he'd ever seen. He said he would especially like to

teach SEA to one of the "academic" classes in his school.

The students' responses to SEA were mixed and probably were more functions of being in a study than of SEA itself. On the one hand, many students were suspicious and referred to all aspects of SEA as a "test," perhaps because of the controlled pacing of activities and use of worksheets, in addition to the general measures and unit tests used and the knowledge that they were involved in a study. On the other hand, there were several indications that many were proud of the special status they believed was attached to having been chosen to participate in the study. Some very positive aspects of the students' responses to SEA itself were their interest in the filmstrips and the teacher's report of their greater effort in SEA than in their other courses.

One aspect of the greater degree of effort that the teacher reported was that the students did take the SEA unit tests seriously. And, with the exception of the last unit test, the students did exhibit definite improvement in objectives-referenced performance from before to after relevant SEA instruction. However, for the many reasons presented above and perhaps others, the students' level of objectives achievement was never very high, averaging about 20 percent per student across the tests.

In conclusion, because of the considerable departure from the developer's intents, the SEA implementation in Case F did not allow for a clear test of either SEA's effectiveness in objectives attainment or the acceptability of SEA to the students. On the other hand, the departures in in SEA implementation probably occurred because the teacher judged that

much of the SEA content and activities needed modification to make it more intellectually available to his class of special students and more congruent with their lifestyles.

Conclusion of the case studies. The preceding reports of six case studies of SEA use and effectiveness were designed to provide protrayals of the classroom life of SEA in diverse settings. These findings have also indicated that revisions in the version of SEA tested during the 1976-77 school year probably would improve SEA's acceptability and effectiveness in settings in which SEA was not effective and/or not well received. A summary of revision findings is presented in the section immediately following.

Formative Evaluation

As discussed in the Analyses subsection of the Methods section, the findings concerning actual lesson presentation, appeal, and effectiveness that were used in the course revision were specific to parts of SEA lessons. However, for purposes of reporting, these findings were summarized by relating the revisions implied into a relatively manageable number of categories. These revision categories include teacher control of presentation and concomitant management issues, provision of alternatives for various student users, Unit II revisions, changes in objectives, student privacy rights, and design or format of the Teacher's Manual.

Presentation mode. Several interesting points regarding the presentation mode alternatives were made by the teachers participating in the study. All were in favor of retaining the audio cassettes. The general

consensus was based on the usefulness of having particularly difficult concepts presented accurately, the modeling offered, and the variety the tapes offered students. However, the teachers also thought that with more familiarity with the program they would opt for more teacher-led presentations. They projected that more provision for conducting a lesson themselves would also allow them to handle any negative reactions to taped presentations which might occur in individual classes and would permit the teacher to direct particular activities for which the potential for management problems in some classes was revealed during the study.

In addition, there were reports of negative reactions to the audio delivery styles of the narrators employed on the tapes. In production of the revised materials, greater attention was given to this aspect of the audio portion of the instruction.

Student considerations. As was noted previously, the student users of the materials in the study came from diverse backgrounds and possessed a wide range of ability. The analyses, particularly of the student responses, lent support to revisions that would make the materials more suitable and meaningful to varied student populations.

Many of the concepts and lesson activities were exemplified through stories about, and on-tape modeling by, young persons. Some of these examples were reported as being inappropriate or unrealistic, particularly to nonwhite, urban students. In such cases the stories have been changed or modified, using examples drawn from the students to make them more

realistic to the age group in general. Further, the Teacher's Manual revisions offer alternative stories and examples, and suggestions for modification of given situations, which are aimed at making the materials more meaningful to the urban youngster.

The major goal of the program is to teach a core strategy for students to use in their own lives. Some of the concepts and skills underlying this strategy are complex. Previous tryouts of the materials had enabled the developers to break apart and sequence the instruction to facilitate student learning. However, the analyses of the current study data revealed that students of lesser ability showed very low levels of achievement in mastering some of the basic concepts and skills. Changes in instruction involving reading and pacing were made.

The reading load of the program presented in the study was quite modest. Most often it consisted of simple directions and short paragraphs. The reading level was geared to grade 5. In addition, the printed directions on worksheets and study book pages most often were also given on the tape or repeated by the teacher. However, the analyses revealed that lack of reading (and writing) skills still interfered with successful use of the materials in some classes.

Thus, the revisions include more provision for oral responses and frequent requests that the teacher read particular worksheets or study book pages to the class. In group work situations, it is suggested that an able reader be included in each group. The instances where these directions are deemed necessary are clearly indicated in the current revision of the Teacher's Manual.

Also, whenever possible, illustrations have been employed in the revised materials to expand definitions, and physical activities have been introduced which exemplify or reinforce certain concepts.

More provisions have been made for breaking lessons into parts to allow the teacher to vary the instructional pace to meet varied student abilities. Additional remedial exercises are also provided, and homework suggestions are given.

Unit II revisions. The revisions recommended for Unit II, the only unit dramatically revised, exemplify and expand upon some of the concerns raised above. The unit as designed in the study required the students to work in groups, each group using one of four "cases" of teenagers holding specified values. The instruction was structured to give the students practice in using the strategy by taking their case character through each strategy step and engaging in behaviors, such as role-taking, that are seen as being necessary to accomplish the steps. Earlier tryouts had shown the students to be engaged by the instruction, the variety of activities and and the group work interaction throughout the unit.

This was again the reaction in several classes in the current study. However, in a number of other classes the unit posed great difficulties. The main problem was that of management growing out of teacher disinclination toward group work or lack of experience on the part of both teacher and students in such a learning situation. Having groups of students working with differing materials required much preparation and taxed the management skills of those teachers unused to this mode. The very nature

of the group work demanded a great deal of self-monitoring and group-work skill on the part of the students. It also required the ability to follow quite complicated directions. It was therefore decided to reconstruct the unit, allowing for a great degree of teacher option in presentation and organization.

In the revised version, teachers may elect to have the class work together with one story, thus providing much more control over both process and feedback. The class work may be directed by the tape or the teacher. The teacher may also choose to have the students work in groups, each group using a different case study. Detailed directions for implementing either option are provided in the manual. The student materials have been simplified not only to facilitate activities but also to allow for better delivery or feedback. Certain group activities such as the "action drama" have been eliminated, because they, rather than the strategy, became the focus of the unit. The relationship of the instructional events to the strategy has been highlighted in simple terms. Also, a new case study, more relevant to the life experience of urban nonwhite students, has been added. Finally, the "cases" are now called "stories" to avoid the perjorative quality associated with "cases" for some students.

Changes in objectives. The analyses also indicated that demanding recall of what were essentially enroute or faciliatating objectives often interfered with student achievement of the main objectives of the lesson. The plethora of objectives tended to obscure the main lesson point even for for the most able students. Thus, the focus of each lesson has been

sharpened to relate the activities and knowledge recall directly to the strategy and basic concepts. Facilitating objectives are retained but not tested, and are often satisfied by performance on worksheets. The reduction in the amount of recall may also alleviate the test-like quality of the course noted by a number of students.

Privacy issues. An essential part of all SEA instruction has been the requirement for personal application of the strategy. This involves a number of activities wherein the students collect and record information about themselves. Great care had been taken with the 1976-77 version of SEA to ensure the right to privacy of the individual student. Precautions included advising the students that they need not share personal information if they didn't wish to and forewarning students of any sharing that would be required. Also, teachers were cautioned to allow students to abstain from sharing, to not call on students who didn't volunteer, and to not pressure or allow peers to pressure the students who opted not to share. Although the overwhelming number of students did not report any invasion of privacy, several students did report as a "harmful effect" the fact that the teacher had access to personal information. In addition, observations and student response pages indicated that certain discussion subjects or stories prompted disclosures which were more revealing of personal situations than was desirable in a classroom.

Revisions have been made that include changing these particular discussion contexts to avoid leading the students into undue disclosure.

Most importantly, the teachers have been given strong direction in the Teacher's Manual regarding the handling of the students' personal record pages. This involves an initial decision as to whether to check such pages or to adapt suggested alternatives for checking completion and accuracy. If the decision is to check the pages, the teacher is directed as to when to announce and what to say about the checking. The narration also mentions that the teachers will inform the students regarding how the worksheet will be handled, and alerts the students to anticipate such direction. The Teacher's Manual also contains reminders regarding student privacy at all points where it might be an issue.

Teacher's Manual design. The Teacher's Manual supplied to the participating teachers consisted of notes and suggestions for lesson presentation, a copy of the audio script and student materials for each lesson in the course as well as an introduction to the program. In addition, copies of all tests and scoring directions were included. This amounted to 680 pages of typescript bound in a three-ring notebook. Both the size and organization of the Manual were found to be awkward by a number of the teachers.

Although more sophisticated printing and binding might have made the existing volume somewhat less cumbersome, it would still have been hefty and not necessarily easier to use. It was thus decided, in consultation with several of the teachers, to print the Manual in several volumes. The notes and suggestions which the teachers use to guide them in preparation for and presentation of each lesson are in one volume. The audio scripts

are in a separate volume. The introduction to the materials, expanded to include additional general information which teachers reported would be useful and which several reviewers suggested, is in a third volume.

CURRENT VERSION OF SEA

The following is a description of the final configuration of the revision of the SEA course.

The course is presented in 35 half-hour lessons, arranged in four units of instruction. As in the previous version, SEA is centered around the six-step strategy which makes operative the course-given definition of ethical action. The only change in the strategy steps is in the wording of Step 1, which is now called "Identify the Value Question." This change was made to focus the step more clearly on the question which the students are asked to state, as well as to avoid the implication that the strategy is a problem-solving device. The general objectives of the course are essentially the same; specific lesson objectives, however, have been restated and certain lessons reshaped to relate the content more closely to the strategy and the key parts of the ethical action definition.

The basic program is contained on 9 audio cassettes and 3 filmstrips. Although as many of the lessons as possible have been written for possible presentation by the teacher, a tape-led presentation of all but a few lessons has been retained as a back-up option. In addition, the delivery styles of both narrators on the tape have been modified in response to adverse student/teacher reactions.

The audio tapes are accompanied by three volumes designed for teacher use. Volume I is the Introduction to the SEA course. Having the Introduction as a separate volume has allowed the inclusion of a more detailed description of the course, its rationale and the history of its development along with more information about the course content and objectives, including a course overview chart. Having a separate volume also allows the inclusion of information about student privacy issues, suggested response to parent inquiries, and other general information regarding implementation of the course. As an additional use, the teacher will be able to lend the Introduction to an interested parent or colleague and still retain the instructions needed to teach the course.

Volume II is the Teacher's Notes and Suggestions and it functions similarily to a standard teacher's manual. It contains detailed instructions for each lesson including statements of objectives, suggestions for materials preparation, classroom arrangements, lesson outlines, optional presentation modes (either all teacher, tape and teacher, or all tape) and suggestions for supplementary activities. It also includes the teacher's copy of the student study book pages, worksheets, tests, and correction pages grouped together by lesson. Volume II also contains duplicates of elements in Volume I to which the teacher might need to refer during the course, e.g., the Course Overview chart. A system of graphic symbols has been incorporated into the manual. These "flags" appear as words in a different type face beside paragraphs of the lesson procedures that relate to important management aspects of the lessons as

follows: MGMT, to warn the teacher of a possible problem involving class management (such as students' movement within the classroom, handing out materials, and collecting materials); DON'T OMIT, to warn the teacher of an important activity or concept which must not be overlooked; TIME, to warn the teacher to stay within the time limits suggested for a discussion or activity so as to be able to complete the lesson within the allotted class time; the FOCUS, to call the teacher's attention to the main points to be made in the lesson.

Volume III is the Audio Scripts volume. The audio scripts were the elements least often referred to by the teacher during the tryouts. However, they were indispensable when the tape player was inoperative and the teacher had to read from the script to conduct the lesson. Also, with the present configuration of the course -- that is, with more lessons written for teacher direction -- the audio scripts are needed for those times when the lesson directions call on the teacher to read aloud the modeling of course concepts and activity directions. To maximize the utility of the audio scripts, the volume also contains duplicates of portions of Volume II to which the teacher might need to refer to conduct the lesson. Most often these are directions and/or questions to be used in conducting a class discussion, class management recommendations, guide line for teacher participation, and information for supplying activity feedback.

The student materials for the course comprise a nonconsumable 40-page illustrated student study book, 47 pages of illustrated consumable worksheets and 10 pages of consumable tests.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chapman, Marian L., and Florence V. Davis. Skills for Ethical Action: A Rationale. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1977.

Chapman, Marian L., and Florence V. Davis. Skills for Ethical Action: A Process Approach to Judgment and Action, Educational Leadership, 35 (March, 1978), in press.

Klafter, Marcia B ., and Joan D. Wallace. A Bibliography on Moral/Values Education. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1976.

Sanders, Nicholas M., and Marcia B. Klafter. The Importance and Desired Characteristics of Moral/Ethical Education in the Public Schools of the U.S.A.: A Systematic Analysis of Recent Documents. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1975.

Skills for Ethical Action Teacher's Manual. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1977.